



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES OF CASES.

Automobiles—Liability of Manufacturer for Injury Caused by Defect.—In *Johnson v. Cadillac Motor Car Co.*, 261 Fed. 878, the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held that the manufacturer of an automobile, who fails to use reasonable care in inspecting and testing the wheels, is liable to a purchaser injured by the breaking of a defective wheel, though such purchaser bought from a dealer.

The court said in part: "Since this court decided this case, when it was here before, the New York Court of Appeals has decided *MacPherson v. Buick Motor Co.*, 217 N. Y. 382, 111 N. E. 1050, L. R. A. 1916F, 696, Ann. Cas. 1916C, 440 (1916). That court affirmed the court below in holding, in a case similar in its facts to the instant case, that the manufacturer of an automobile is not at liberty to put his product on the market without subjecting its component parts to ordinary and simple tests, and is not absolved from the duty of inspection because it buys the wheels from a reputable manufacturer. The court held the manufacturer's liability was not confined to the immediate purchaser, but extended to third persons not in contractual relations with it. In the course of its opinion the court, Judge Cardozo writing, said:

"Beyond all question, the nature of an automobile gives warning of probable danger if its construction is defective. This automobile was designed to go 50 miles an hour. Unless its wheels were sound and strong, injury was almost certain. It was as much a thing of danger as a defective engine for a railroad. The defendant knew the danger. It knew, also, that the car would be used by persons other than the buyer. This was apparent from its size; there were seats for three persons. It was apparent, also, from the fact that the buyer was a dealer in cars, who bought to resell. The maker of this car supplied it for the use of purchasers from the dealer just as plainly as the contractor in *Devlin v. Smith* supplied the scaffold for use by the servants of the owner. The dealer was indeed the one person of whom it might be said with some approach to certainty that by him the car would not be used. Yet the defendant would have us say that he was the one person whom it was under a legal duty to protect. The law does not lead us to so inconsequent a conclusion. Precedents drawn from the days of travel by stage-coach do not fit the condition of travel today. The principle that the danger must be imminent does not change, but the things subject to the principle do change. They are whatever the needs of life in a developing civilization require them to be."

False Imprisonment—Theft of Property Left Unprotected When Owner Wrongfully Arrested.—Where an officer unlawfully arrested